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# 1 Introduction

The objectives of the SID on XR enhancements for NR in Rel-18 are listed in the following [1]:

|  |
| --- |
| The study is to be based on Release 17 TR 38.838, on corresponding Release 17 work from SA4 (as per SP-210043) and on Release 18 work from SA2 (as per SP-211166). Objectives on XR-awareness in RAN (RAN2):* Study and identify the XR traffic (both UL and DL) characteristics, QoS metrics, and application layer attributes beneficial for the gNB to be aware of.
* Study how the above information aids XR-specific traffic handling.

Objectives on XR-specific Power Saving (RAN1, RAN2):* Study XR specific power saving techniques to accommodate XR service characteristics (periodicity, multiple flows, jitter, latency, reliability, etc...). Focus is on the following techniques:
	+ C-DRX enhancement.
	+ PDCCH monitoring enhancement.

Objectives on XR-specific capacity improvements (RAN1, RAN2):* Study mechanisms that provide more efficient resource allocation and scheduling for XR service characteristics (periodicity, multiple flows, jitter, latency, reliability, etc…). Focus is on the following mechanisms:
	+ SPS and CG enhancements;
	+ Dynamic scheduling/grant enhancements.
 |

This document provides the summary of the discussions regarding the last SID objective regarding XR-specific capacity improvements during RAN1#109-e under the following email thread assigned by RAN1 Chair:

//This one is to use NWM – please use RAN1-109-e-NWM-R18-XR-04 as the document name

[109-e-R18-XR-04] Email discussion on XR capacity enhancement by May 20 – Sorour (Ericsson)

* Check points: May 13, May 20

This document is a revision of R1-2205266.

The companies’ views regarding Questionnaires can be find in the attached pdf file.

## List of agreements/conclusions at this meeting

**Agreement**

Rel-17 evaluation methodology for XR capacity enhancement captured in TR 38.838 is used as the baseline evaluation methodology for XR capacity enhancement of Rel-18 SI on XR enhancements.

**Conclusion**

Study of network coding for capacity enhancements during Rel-18 XR SI is down prioritized in RAN1.

## List of proposals for discussions

**Proposal 1-2A-r3:**

* To  support a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, capacity performance gain by the technique as compared to baseline should be shown.
	+ Capacity performance gain by the candidate technique as compared to baseline is a necessary condition to consider supporting the candidate technique.

**Proposal 1-2B-r3:**

* For each candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, companies are encouraged to consider the following common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique:
	+ Identify the XR-specific issue(s) that the enhancement technique is addressing
	+ Identify the necessity of the enhancement technique to address the issues
	+ Identify whether/how the enhancements provide sufficient benefit/performance capacity gain.
		- Consider at least feasibility, complexity, and system level performance evaluations in comparing the enhancement techniques
* The baseline scheduling scheme when comparing the proposed capacity enhancements techniques is:
	+ Dynamic scheduling and/or
	+ Semi-persistent scheduling / Configured grant scheduling [e.g. when proposed enhancements are only relevant for SPS/CG based transmissions]

**Proposed conclusion 1-2C-r3**:

* Companies are encouraged to use the capacity Excel sheet attached with TR 38.383 in [RP-213652](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/TSG_RAN/TSGR_94e/Docs/RP-213652.zip)  for recording the simulation results that are provided in their contributions.

**Proposal 2-1-r3:**

To study support of a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic based SPS/CG transmissions, companies are encouraged to consider the following:

* Prioritize the following studies:
	+ - Study support of multiple PDSCHs SPStransmission occasions in a period
		- Study support of multiple PUSCHs CG transmission occasions in a period
		- Study support of dynamic adaptation of SPS/CG parameters
		- Study support of non-integer periodicity for SPS/CG transmissions.
		- Note: Other studies are not precluded, as well as the combination of the above studies.
* Follow the *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique*

**Proposal 3-1-r3:**

To study support of a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic based dynamic scheduling/grant transmissions, companies are encouraged to consider the following:

* Prioritize the following studies:
	+ - Study extending capability of single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs/PUSCHs for FR2-2 to FR1/FR2.
		- Study HARQ-ACK and CBG enhancements for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs.
		- Study allowing different configurations per PDSCH/PUSCH, e.g., for MCS indication for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs.
		- Study enhancement on scheduling request and/or BSR.
		- Note: Other studies are not precluded as well as the combination of the above studies.
* Follow the *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique.*

**Proposed conclusion 4-1-r3:**

* It is common understanding that studying of RAN2 proposed techniques for XR-specific scheduling information to improve XR capacity can be studied in RAN1 upon request from RAN2.

**Proposal 5-1-r3:**

* **Further discuss whether to consider the following areas for link adaptation enhancements to improve XR capacity**
	1. **Delta MCS**
	2. **Soft HARQ-ACK feedback**
	3. **Cooperative MIMO scheme via precoding technique - bi-directional training**
	4. **Enhanced link adaptation for CBG-based transmission**
	5. **CSI report enhancements to address the different BLER requirements of different XR flows**
	6. **~~Beam management and CSI reporting during the DRX Off cycle for FR2~~**
	7. **Dynamic L1 based MG activation/deactivation. Reuse current R16/R17 RRM relaxation condition to allow scheduling in MG to transform the R16/R17 RRM power saving gain into capacity gain.**
* **Note: Continue discussion at least during this meeting (RAN1#109-e) for potential deprioritization of the list above or down-selection of candidate study areas from the list above**.

**Proposal 6-1-r3:**

Study adaptive inter-UE/intra-UE multiplexing techniques, including e.g. finer granularity preemption indication to improve XR capacity performance.

# 2 Discussions

## Performance evaluations and methodologies

The following table lists the proposals and observations in the contributions submitted in this meeting related to the performance evaluations and methodologies for XR capacity enhancements techniques.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals and Observations** |
| FUTUREWE | Observation 1: For the FR1 Dense Urban Scenario and with the assumption of zero forcing precoding, the capacity of the XR system is ~8.0 UEs/cell for uneven UE load, with data packet rate of 45Mbps, with slot configuration of [DDDUU].Observation 2: For the FR1 UMa Scenario and with the assumption of zero forcing precoding, the capacity of the XR system is ~5.2 UEs/cell for uneven UE load, with data packet rate of 45Mbps, with slot configuration of [DDDUU].Observation 3: For the Dense Urban Scenario with the BiT precoding assumption, the gain is 64.8% for the XR system capacity with the assumption of having uneven, with data packet rate of 45Mbps, with slot configuration of [DDDUU].Observation 4: For the UMa Scenario with the BiT precoding assumption, the gain is 26.9% for the XR system capacity with the assumption of having uneven load, with data packet rate of 45Mbps, with slot configuration of [DDDUU].Observation 5: TDD ZF performance can be significantly improved by flexible A-SRS triggering with dynamically indicated partial frequency sounding.Observation 6: DU scenario experiences higher gains than Uma scenario with the BiT precoding relative to Zero-Forcing precoding, due to the shorter inter-cell distance, in which interference is more dominating than noise. |
| vivo | Observation 2: It is benifical to use CG PUSCH for conveying UL pose/control stream, as well as for BSR reporting for XR traffic.Observation 5: It is beneficial to study potential enhancements for UL packet discarding for XR traffic. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Observation 3: Compared to legacy SPS, MCS update techniques are beneficial to increase resource utilization, which results in capacity performance enhancement.Observation 4: Unused resources release techniques help UE save power consumption from blind SPS PDSCH detection.Observation 7: Multiple CG configurations with resource release and resource indication can provide capacity performance gain compared to legacy multiple CG configurations.Observation 8: For both 10Mbps@60fps traffic model and 20Mbps@60fps traffic, more than a half proportion of packet sizes are overestimated using BS level table in [3].Observation 9: In uplink transmission, overestimated packet sizes may cause capacity performance loss. And uplink transmission with precise BSR indication can bring capacity performance gain.Observation 10: Delta MCS information for re-transmission is capable of increasing significantly XR capacity performance.Observation 11: The delta MCS value is relatively small, so that the overhead of signaling can be reduced.Observation 12: Enhanced preemption indication is capable of enhancing capacity performance when multi-streams model is considered in the system.Observation 13: Network coding technique is capable of enhancing the reliability of transmission.Observation 14: For 30Mbps@60fps, capacity performance is increased about [12.66%] with network coding for DL VR/AR traffic model in DL FR1 indoor scenario.Observation 15: Compared with PDCP duplication, network coding improves the system mean throughput by 8.97%, and improves the 5% UE throughput by 21.3%. |
| Ericsson | Observation 6 Current BSR coding model introduces uncertainties impacting system capacity with XR traffic.Observation 7 Including additional delay information in BSR can increase system capacity.Observation 8 If late application packets are not of value for an XR service, solutions dropping application packets that are expected to be late will allow for increased XR capacity.Proposal 7 For performance evaluation of candidate capacity enhancement techniques, reuse as much as possible the evaluation methodology and simulation assumptions in TR 38.838. |
| InterDigital, Inc. | Observation 1: Achieving high system capacity with XR traffic in UL and DL in different deployment scenarios (e.g. InH, DU, UMa) is extremely challengingObservation 2: Given the interdependencies between the PDUs, all PDUs in a PDU set need to be successfully delivered within a PDU set-level latency requirement for counting towards capacityObservation 3: In multi-stream scenario, the PDUs in different traffic streams need to be received by UE (in DL) or application server (in UL) within a maximum inter-stream jitter value to be counted towards capacityObservation 4: Transitioning from InH to DU deployment scenario has a significant impact on the capacity as shown by a large drop in #UEs/cell that can be supported for all XR applicationsObservation 5: In DU deployment scenario, FIFO based scheduling slightly outperforms PF at low load, while PF scheduling yields best performance as the load increases Observation 6: UL capacity of multi-stream traffic is typically less than that of single-stream traffic when using PF and FIFO based scheduling approaches.Observation 7: Resource sharing based scheduling approach (e.g. allocation of RBs to all UEs in cell) enables UL capacity achieved with multi-stream traffic to be similar with that of single stream trafficObservation 8: PF-based scheduling is generally suited for maximizing purely throughput-based performance. However, the limiting factors for capacity due to the PDB requirements make PF-based scheduling less suited for XR trafficObservation 9: As enhancement schemes, FIFO and resource sharing based scheduling can be better suited to meet XR-specific traffic requirements such as PDB and high throughput, and can in turn yield improved capacity performance when compared to a purely PF based approach.Observation 10: Handling of lower size of per-PDU set (e.g. for I-frame, P-frame), on average, for DL multi-stream traffic case can result in slightly higher percentage of satisfied UEs compared to the single stream caseProposal 3: RAN1 to perform evaluations of XR-specific resource allocation and scheduling enhancement techniques for evaluating the capacity performanceProposal 4: Reuse the baseline evaluation assumptions (e.g. deployment scenarios, SLS parameters, traffic models) in TR 38.838 when evaluating capacity performanceProposal 5: Starting point for potential enhancement techniques for capacity can be those identified during Rel-17 SI (e.g. delay aware scheduling, prioritizing/pre-empting important streams in DL/UL, multi-TB scheduling, enhanced BSR) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 1: Adding more eMBB users deteriorates the QoE of the XR users. This is the key point that should be considered when using more realistic simulation scenarios with multiple types of traffic.Observation 2: Use of CBG-based HARQ transmissions is beneficial for XR use cases, given the large transport block sizes, as well as the PDB that allows for couple of HARQ retransmissions.Observation 3: The current link adaptation mechanisms, and the corresponding UE CQI feedback designs are suboptimal for CBG-based transmissions.Observation 4: Application of enhanced CQI scheme can enable enhanced OLLA to improve the performance of the CBG-based transmission. For instance, as shown in Figure 2, the number of satisfied users has increased by 2 times for the case with enhanced CQI and eOLLA.Proposal 1: Use the capacity evaluation methodology from TR 38.838 as a starting point, when developing the methodology for capacity enhancements studies in Release 18 Study on XR Enhancements for NR .Proposal 2: To facilitate efficient study of applicable capacity enhancements schemes, identify the minimum set of simulation parameters and deployments. Example areas for potential down scoping: e.g., deployment scenario, frequency range.Proposal 3: The proposed unified set of traffic model parameters for capacity enhancements evaluations is summarized in Table 1.Proposal 4: Use the baseline KPIs for capacity evaluation from TR 38.838 and Rel17 XR over NR SI.Proposal 5: It is suggested to include one optional simulation case with XR and best effort eMBB users. All the scenario assumptions for DU and InH, as well as the XR traffic models and XR performance KPIs remain the same as in [2], while just adding N full buffer eMBB background users per cell. The default value of N is 1, but other values are also acceptable. Proposal 6: For the option with XR and best effort eMBB users, we suggest defining additional standard KPIs for eMBB performance such as: average aggregated eMBB cell throughput, 5%-ile, 50%-ile and 95%-ile eMBB user throughput. Other KPIs to reflect the eMBB performance are not excluded. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Observation 3: In 5G NR system, measurement gaps (MG) are configured to allow UE to do inter-frequency neighbour cell measurement and the corresponding RF tuning for RRM purposes (e.g. mobility, load balancing, CA set-up). In measurement gap, NW cannot schedule UE to transmit/receive data.l A system level simulation shown in Figure 4 shows that XR DL capacity falls from 10 (no MG) to less than 2 (MGRP=80,MGL=6) and less than 1 (MGRP=40,MGL=6). |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Observation 2: Soft HARQ-ACK is observed to provide a significant gain in XR capacity over baseline HARQ-ACK.Observation 3: The gain of soft HARQ-ACK relative to baseline HARQ-ACK increases when the HARQ round trip delay increases. |

**Moderator’s summary:**

Few companies have provided simulations results as part of the analysis of the capacity enhancement techniques. The techniques are based on physical layer enhancements, higher layer enhancements or both, but companies provided system level evaluation results since RAN1 has traditionally been the home for carrying out simulations to provide the quantitative analysis.

* **Companies with simulation results in respective contributions**
	+ FW, vivo, ZTE, Ericsson, IDC, Nokia, MTK, QC

Irrespective of the techniques, general proposals on the assumptions and/or role of simulations are provided which are categorised as the following:

* **Proposals to confirm reusing Rel-17 XR SI simulation assumptions, as well as minimum set for Rel-18 SI.**
	+ Ericsson, Nokia
* **Proposals to emphasize on inclusion of performance evaluations for analysis of the techniques**
	+ Nokia, IDC
* **Proposals to further identify a mixed traffic simulation assumptions to facilitate efficient study**
	+ Nokia

### 2.1.1 Discussion 1st round

**Moderator’s comment:**

This section can focus on general aspects related to the evaluation methodologies as well as discussions on collection and organization of the simulations results.

With respect to simulation results presented in a contribution to investigate an enhancement technique, companies are encouraged to provide their views and comments in the section covering the related discussions of the enhancement technique. For the review, please consider the information provided in the related contributions.

Therefore, the related proposals for discussions on evaluation methodologies for the first round of discussions are presented below. In the feedback table, companies’ views on these proposals as well as other aspects are kindly requested.

**Proposal 1-1:**

* For performance evaluation of candidate capacity enhancement techniques for Rel 18 XR SI,
	+ the capacity evaluation methodology and KPIs from TR 38.838 are reused.
		- the minimum set of the traffic model parameters in the table below are reused as baseline, similarly to Rel-17 XR evaluation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Traffic models** | **Data rate****[Mbps]** | **Packet arrival rate****[fps]** | **PDB****[ms]** |
| DL  | AR/VR  | 30  | 60  | 10  |
| CG  | 30  | 60  | 15  |
| UL  | VR/CG: Pose/control  | 0.2  | 250  | 10  |
| AR: Option 1 (single stream model)  | 10  | 60  | 30  |

**Proposal 1-2:**

* To analyze the candidate capacity enhancement techniques, RAN1 strives to evaluate the capacity performance gain by the techniques.

**Proposal 1-3:**

* Include one optional simulation case with XR and best effort eMBB users as the following:
	+ Add N full buffer eMBB background users per cell. The default value of N is 1.
		- Other values are not excluded.
	+ Define additional standard KPI for eMBB performance as the average aggregated eMBB cell throughput, 5%-ile, 50%-ile and 95%-ile eMBB user throughput.
		- Other KPIs to reflect the eMBB performance are not excluded.
	+ Note: All the scenario assumptions for DU and InH, as well as the XR traffic models and XR performance KPIs remain the same as in TR 38.838

#### 2.1.1.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the Proposals 1-1, 1-2, 1-3?
	+ Please indicate whether in general you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals.
* **Q2:** Please share any other comment that helps this discussion, including views on aspects regarding the collection and organization of the simulation results.
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.1.1.2 Summary

* **Proposal 1-1**: Companies are in general fine with this proposal. However few comments for improvements were made that are considered in the updated proposal:
	+ Emphasize the objective
	+ Include Multi-flow model for AR UL
	+ Include a sub-bullet for additional traffic model
* **Proposal 1-2**: Companies are in general fine with this proposal. However few comments made to clarify the evaluation can help to compare and select promising enhancements for WI.
	+ **@ATT:** Regarding the clarity on “capacity performance gain”, Moderator understanding is that based on P1-1, the Rel-17 KPIs and methodologies will be used.

* **Proposal 1-3**: This proposal did not receive strong support. Few comments received on clarification, e.g., full buffer assumption (ATT), user distribution (FW), eMBB KPIs (LG).
	+ **OK**: Nokia, CEWiT, Ericsson, ATT, FW
	+ **Not OK**: Apple, MTK, QC, CATT, Intel, ZTE, Sony, HW
	+ **Open to discuss**: DCM, MoT, IDC, LG

**Moderator recommendations before GTW on Friday 13:**

It is unlikely the proposal to be supported. However, Moderator can keep the discussion open for the proponent (Nokia) and interested companies to provide clarifications on the questions raised. When the proposal is stable, it can be proposed as a conclusion to serve as a common baseline for companies interested in eMBB evaluation to use the assumptions

**Proposal 1-1:**

* For performance evaluation of candidate capacity enhancement techniques for Rel 18 XR SI objective of “XR-specific capacity improvements”,
	+ the capacity evaluation methodology and KPIs from TR 38.838 are reused.
		- the minimum set of the traffic model parameters in the table below are reused as baseline, similarly to Rel-17 XR evaluation.
		- Note: If necessary, additional traffic model parameters from TR 38.838 can also be reported by companies.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Traffic models** | **Data rate****[Mbps]** | **Packet arrival rate****[fps]** | **PDB****[ms]** |
| DL  | AR/VR  | 30  | 60  | 10  |
| CG  | 30  | 60  | 15  |
| UL  | VR/CG: Pose/control  | 0.2  | 250  | 10  |
| AR: ~~Option~~Model 1 (single stream model)  | 10  | 60  | 30  |
| AR: Model 2 (two streams model)  | See TR 38.838, section 5.5.2.2 |

**Proposal 1-2A:**

* To ~~analyze~~ support a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, ~~RAN1 strives to evaluate the~~ sufficient capacity performance gain by the techniques should be shown.

**Proposal 1-2B:**

* For each candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, companies are encouraged to consider the following *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique*:
	+ Identify the issues that the enhancement technique is addressing
	+ Identify the necessity of the enhancement technique to address the issues
	+ Identify whether/how the enhancements provide sufficient benefit/performance gain.

**Moderator recommendation after GTW on Friday 13:**

Proposal 1-1 was discussed and led to the following agreement.

**Agreement**

**Rel-17 evaluation methodology for XR capacity enhancement captured in TR 38.838 is used as the baseline evaluation methodology for XR capacity enhancement of Rel-18 SI on XR enhancements.**

Proposal 1-2A and 1-2B were discussed but not concluded.

During the discussion, Proposal 1-2A were modified as the following:

**Proposal 1-2A:**

* To ~~analyze~~ support a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, ~~RAN1 strives to evaluate the~~ sufficient capacity performance gain by the techniques should be shown.
	+ Sufficient capacity performance gain is a necessary condition

**Regarding Proposal 1-2B, the discussion led to couple of questions:**

* Companies discussed that to compare XR capacity enhancement proposals, at least the following should be considered:
* Need for baseline scheme
	+ It was proposed to consider dynamic scheduling
* Need to consider feasibility
* Need to consider complexity
* Need to include system level simulation results (SLS).
	+ This is covered by the above agreement and reusing Rel-17 evaluation assumption and methodology.
* Need to compare PDCCH overhead, resource allocation, etc. and not only focus on capacity gain.
	+ On this point, Chair clarified that regardless, the objective is about capacity enhancement. Hence capacity gain is a necessity for an enhancement to be considered.
* A company (Motorola) commented that based on TS 23.501 Table 5.7.4-1 (5QI 89-90), PDB seems to be between 15-20 ms which is inconsistent with the values used in Proposal 1-1 above. Further check is needed to ensure common understanding among companies.

**Based on the discussion in GTW, Moderator updates Proposal 1-2B as the following, to be reviewed:**

**Proposal 1-2B:**

* For each candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, companies are encouraged to consider the following *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique*:
	+ Identify the issues that the enhancement technique is addressing
	+ Identify the necessity of the enhancement technique to address the issues
	+ Identify whether/how the enhancements provide sufficient benefit/performance gain.
		- Consider feasibility, complexity and system level performance evaluations in comparing the enhancement technique
* The baseline scheme to compare the proposed capacity enhancements techniques is:
	+ Dynamic scheduling

### 2.1.2 Discussion 2nd round

#### 2.1.2.1 Questionnaire

**Proposal 1-2A:**

* To ~~analyze~~ support a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, ~~RAN1 strives to evaluate the~~ sufficient capacity performance gain by the techniques should be shown.
	+ Sufficient capacity performance gain is a necessary condition

**Proposal 1-2B:**

* For each candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, companies are encouraged to consider the following *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique*:
	+ Identify the issues that the enhancement technique is addressing
	+ Identify the necessity of the enhancement technique to address the issues
	+ Identify whether/how the enhancements provide sufficient benefit/performance gain.
		- Consider feasibility, complexity, and system level performance evaluations in comparing the enhancement technique
* The baseline scheme to compare the proposed capacity enhancements techniques is:
	+ Dynamic scheduling

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the Proposals 1-2A, Proposal 1-2B above?
	+ Please indicate whether in general you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals.
* **Q2**: A company (Motorola) commented that based on TS 23.501 Table 5.7.4-1 (5QI 89-90), PDB seems to be between 15-20 ms which is inconsistent with the values used in the table in Proposal 1-1. Please your view on the inconsistency.
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.1.2.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

**Q1: Proposal 1-2A**:

In general companies are fine with the direction of the proposals. However, some companies provided suggestions for improvements addressing the followings:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1 | **P1-2A** |
| OK | MTK, CATT, HW, vivo, Samsung, Nokia, DCM, NEC, CWEiT, LG, FW |
| NOK | QC |
| Maybe | IDC, ZTE, Intel |

* “sufficient” is subjective, ambiguous (QC, Intel, Sony, IDC, Samsung)
* Include other metrics (ZTE, IDC, Intel, QC,)
* Include power saving metric (CATT, Samsung)

**Moderator’s recommendations**: Based on SID, any enhancement techniques should provide capacity or power saving gain. This Agenda item is focusing on capacity enhancements. Hence, the priority is that capacity gain should be provided. When capacity gain is provided, comparison among comparable schemes could be based on power saving gain. Moderator suggests not to add other conditions since the proposal does not preclude considering other metrics for proper analysis of the candidate techniques. The proposal only reflects “necessary conditions”. Also, control signalling overhead, and delay would impact capacity and/or power saving.

Hence, Moderator recommends updating the proposal as the following:

**Proposal 1-2A-r2:**

* To ~~analyze~~ support a candidate capacity enhancement technique A for XR traffic, ~~RAN1 strives to evaluate the~~ ~~sufficient~~ capacity performance gain by the techniques should be shown.
	+ ~~Sufficient~~ Larger capacity performance gain by the candidate technique A as compared to any other candidate technique B is a necessary condition for supporting the candidate technique A.
		- For a candidate technique A and a candidate technique B that offer the same capacity performance gains and the candidate technique A requires less UE power, the candidate technique A can be further considered.

**Q1: Proposal 1-2B**:

In general companies are fine with the direction of the proposals. However, some companies provided suggestions for improvements addressing the followings:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1 | **P1-2B** |
| OK | MTK, CATT, HW, vivo, Samsung, Nokia, DCM, LG, FW |
| NOK |   |
| Maybe | IDC, QC, ZTE, NEC, LG, Sony, Intel |

The main concerns are on the baseline scheme to include SPS/CG based scheduling, as well as including other criteria. Also, it was commented that the issues should be XR-specific to be relevant to this SI.

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Moderator recommends considering the following updates aiming to provide following clarifications:

* Clarify issues should be XR-specific
* Clarify main criteria in Proposal 1-2A-r2 should be met (capacity, and if needed power saving gain)
* Clarify additionally we can consider “at least” feasibility, etc. for proper analysis.
* Clarify, baseline is about scheduling. Then, default is dynamic (hopefully all agree). But for some cases, for example small packets without jitter in UL, all agree CG can be used. Hence, SPS/CG is added with addition of “when applicable”.

Hopefully, companies agree that it is not possible to define a strict rule. It is very much based on carrying out the study doing **reasonable assessments.**

Hence, Moderator recommends updating the proposal as the following:

**Proposal 1-2B-r2:**

* For each candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, companies are encouraged to consider the following *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique*:
	+ Identify the XR-specific issue(s) that the enhancement technique is addressing
	+ Identify the necessity of the enhancement technique to address the issues
	+ Identify whether/how the enhancements provide sufficient benefit/performance capacity gain.
		- Consider at least feasibility, complexity, and system level performance evaluations in comparing the enhancement techniques
* The baseline scheduling scheme ~~to compare~~when comparing the proposed capacity enhancements techniques is:
	+ Dynamic scheduling
	+ Semi-persistent scheduling / Configured grant scheduling when applicable

**Q2: On PDB values for simulation assumptions:**

**Summary of views:**

Companies agree to use RAN1 PDB values. If should be understood if there is any further input from SA2, the topic can be discussed.

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Close the discussion.

### 2.1.3 Discussion 3rd round

**Moderator’s comment:**

The proposals 1-2A-r2 and 1-2B-r2 were discussed durignt he GTW. One of the main issue was how to define baseline. Here it is Moderator’s view and recommendation.

On the baseline:

* Checking the contributions with evaluations results at this meeting, companies used different baseline schemes corresponding to the proposed/investigated enhancements. Please review these contributions:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**R1-2203586**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2203586.zip) | Discussion on XR specific capacity enhancements | vivo |
| [**R1-2203607**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2203607.zip) | Discussion on XR specific capacity enhancements techniques | ZTE, Sanechips |
| [**R1-2203639**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2203639.zip) | Discussion on capacity enhancements for XR | Ericsson |
| [**R1-2204124**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2204124.zip) | Discussion on XR specific capacity enhancements | InterDigital, Inc. |
| [**R1-2204675**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2204675.zip) | Discussion on XR-specific capacity enhancements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [**R1-2204699**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2204699.zip) | On XR specific capacity improvement enhancements | MediaTek Inc. |
| [**R1-2205056**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2205056.zip) | Capacity enhancement techniques for XR | Qualcomm Incorporated |

* There is no single candidate enhancement technique that all companies are confident at this stage about its benefit and potential including in the upcoming WID.
* It is a complicated task to define one baseline. I checked all the evaluation results, and the answer is that the choice of baseline by companies “depends”.
* Therefore, for any enhancement technique proposed by company A, another company has a view that there are alternative solutions (legacy or not) that would be preferred.

The most constructive approach in my view is that companies that promoting some enhancements, also try to address the concern of others, by providing evaluations, analysis, etc.  I am sure, by know all companies are aware of each others concerns. We can spend more time massaging the wording, etc. but it is not clear to me if it brings the group forward and we spend our precious time wisely to discuss this issue.

Therefore, my suggestion is to consider the following, with potentially removing the text in [..].

The reason I kept dynamic scheduling is that because in Rel-17, that is the baseline. On the other hand, I didn’t find evaluation results for CG/SPS (maybe I missed).  Back to the bigger point, I would like to move on and try to have more meat in the proposals such that companies know more clearly what covers each study area.

Also, I noticed that in TR, there is an Excel-sheet for recording simulation results. It would be good if companies from next meeting to include those Excel-sheet with their contributions for the next time.

Therefore, I include a recommendation below (**1-2C-r3)**. Please provide suggestion to improve.

**Proposal 1-2A-r3:**

* To  support a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, capacity performance gain by the technique as compared to baseline should be shown.
	+ Capacity performance gain by the candidate technique as compared to baseline is a necessary condition to consider supporting the candidate technique.

**Proposal 1-2B-r3:**

* For each candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic, companies are encouraged to consider the following common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique:
	+ Identify the XR-specific issue(s) that the enhancement technique is addressing
	+ Identify the necessity of the enhancement technique to address the issues
	+ Identify whether/how the enhancements provide sufficient benefit/performance capacity gain.
		- Consider at least feasibility, complexity, and system level performance evaluations in comparing the enhancement techniques
* The baseline scheduling scheme when comparing the proposed capacity enhancements techniques is:
	+ Dynamic scheduling and/or
	+ Semi-persistent scheduling / Configured grant scheduling [e.g. when proposed enhancements are only relevant for SPS/CG based transmissions]

**Proposed conclusion 1-2C-r3**:

Companies are encouraged to use the capacity Excel sheet attached with TR 38.383 in [RP-213652](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/TSG_RAN/TSGR_94e/Docs/RP-213652.zip)  for recording the simulation results that are provided in their contributions.

#### 2.1.3.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the proposals 1-2A-r3, 1-2B-r3, proposed conclusion 1-2C-r3 above?
	+ Please indicate whether you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals.
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.1.3.2 Summary

TBD

## SPS and CG enhancements

The following table lists the proposals in the contributions submitted in this meeting, discussing views on SPS and CG enhancement techniques. For more detailed descriptions and discussions please refer to the corresponding companies’ contributions. Please note that for some enhancements techniques, companies have provided simulations results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Further study capacity enhancements techniques to address variable frame size issue, including mechanisms to allow re-allocating the unused configured grant (CG) resources. |
| CATT | Proposal 3: The SPS enhancement should be considered for XR-specific traffic transmission, such as the SPS is with the additional resource indication.Proposal 4: The Configured Grant UL transmission should be enhanced to support low latency and large data rate transmission of XR traffic. |
| vivo | Proposal 1: Study potential CG PUSCH enhancements for XR video traffic, e.g., aligning with the non-integer periodicity. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 1: Semi-persistent scheduling enhancement techniques, including e.g., indication of unused resources and updated MCS level can be studied for XR service transmission.Proposal 2: Resources indication/release can be considered for enhancing configured grant transmission. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1 Dynamic grant should be considered as a baseline for capacity enhancement study.Proposal 2 Enhancement study of CG/SPS should be limited to non-video traffic with very predictable packet size, e.g., UL pose/BSR.Proposal 3 Study enhancements on CG/SPS periodicity to better match with XR traffic periodicity (including possible jitter) and TDD patterns. |
| NEC | Proposal 1:Study multi-PDSCH/PUSCH occasions per SPS/CG period for XR traffic with large and varying packet size and the mechanism to alleviate the jitter effect.Proposal 2:Study CBG based retransmission for SPS PDSCH for XR traffic with large packet size.Proposal 3:Study enhancement for the mismatch between the periodicity of SPS/CG configuration and the XR packet arrival time.Proposal 4:Specify XR specific configured grant offset parameter such as kOffsetSymbols in Search Space Set configuration.Proposal 5:‘cg-nrofSlots’ may be reused to transmit different transport blocks if PUSCH repetition type is not set. |
| Sony | Proposal 1: Consider Dynamic SPS/CG configuration to dynamically adjust the transmission in order to accommodate the XR traffic pattern.Proposal 2: Pseudo-periodic SPS/CG configuration can be considered for XR traffic with non-integer period.Proposal 3: Multi CS-RNTIs configuration for multi flows in XR can be considered. Proposal 4: A new SPS type configuration that is similar to CG type I configuration can be considered to support multi-flows in XR.Proposal 5: Consider the UE to monitor a subset of configured SPS in a group of configured SPS to handle the jitter of XR traffic. |
| Samsung | Proposal 1: Consider support of multi-TRP/panel transmission for SPS PDSCH.Proposal 6: Study mechanisms to enable CG-PUSCH transmissions from XR UEs with variable packet sizes without a-priori reservation of corresponding resources. |
| Panasonic | Proposal 1: SPS/CG/SR should efficiently handle the non-integer periodicity transmissions, including the video stream frame periodicities like 16.66667, 11.11111, and 8.33333 ms.Proposal 2: Among followings, which approach(s) are taken should be discussed further.Approach 1: Rounding the non-integer transmission instances: the beginning of SPS/CG/SR resource is rounded according to the non-integer periodicity matched to the radio resource granularity.Approach 2: Enabling/disabling the non-integer periodicity instances: A new virtual cycle is defined, which contains enable/disable states and supports non-integer periodicities. The SPS/CG/SR configurations can be linked to the virtual cycle. Only the overlapping resources with the enable state should be considered as valid for transmission or reception.Approach 3: An SPS/CG/SR configuration is configured with alternating periodicities, each periodicity is associated to a number of occasions.Approach 4: DCI to reconfigure Group of SPS/CG/SR: A DCI (re)configures several SPS/CG/SR configurations together. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2: Use the same design principle to solve the periodicity mismatch between XR traffic and DRX, search space set configuration and SPS/CG transmission.Proposal 3: SPS HARQ-ACK enhancement to reduce the HARQ-ACK overhead for jitter solution should be further studied. (e.g. Multiple SPS PDSCH occasions share one HARQ-ACK bit)Proposal 4: For SPS or configured grant transmission, allocate multiple PDSCH/PUSCH transmission occasions in each period should be further studied.Proposal 5: Adaptive resource allocation for SPS transmission should be further studied (e.g. by CG-UCI).Proposal 6: Early termination of the CG transmissions (in one XR period) should be further studied( e.g. by CG-UCI). |
| TCL Communication Ltd. | Proposal 1: Pre-defined a fixed transmission pattern of SPS/CG within an integer periodicity for XR can be considered. Proposal 2: Additional PDCCH monitor occasions can be considered for XR during the range of jitter. Proposal 3: Dynamic changing resource allocation of SPS and CG for XR can be considered.  |
| Apple | Proposal 3-3: introduce the support of non-integer periodicity for SPS configurations/Configured grant configurations. Proposal 3-4: study enhancement to CG-UCI to support indication of MCS and/or PRB adjustment. Proposal 3-5: Study whether code block group based transmission can be used to support QoS enhancement at lower layers. |
| CMCC | Proposal 1. Adaptive SPS/CG scheduling with simplified DCI can be considered for XR service.Proposal 2. Multiple periodicities configuration for one SPS configuration can be considered for XR service, which the multiple periodicities are used by turns. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Proposal 1: Study dynamic update of SPS/CG parameters for XR, e.g., periodicity, resource allo-cation, MCS, or TCI state/spatial relation.Proposal 2: Study multiple SPS PDSCHs or CG PUSCHs in one SPS/CG periodicity for XR (one DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs has already been supported in Rel-17 for FR2-2. It can be a starting point for studying multiple SPS PDSCHs / CG PUSCHs in one periodicity, and the work-load is expected to be not large.). |
| Lenovo | Proposal 7: Study SPS/CG enhancements to address XR traffic variable packet size and arrival time and quasi-synchronous communication of multiple flows. Enhancements may include:• Enabling, within a SPS/CG period, multiple SPS/CG configurations having the same periodicity with SPS resources of different size and starting time• Joint activation of multiple SPS/CG configurations for an indicated duration to handle multiple traffics of different QoS requirements in a quasi-synchronous manner with reduced control signaling overhead |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 1: At least for jitter handling with SPS/CG configuration, it is necessary to allocate multiple TOs in a periodicity with single SPS/CG configurations. Proposal 2: It can be considered to activate/release multiple SPS/CG and/or other semi-static configuration with least number of DCIs. Proposal 3: It can be considered to define UE behaviour on interaction between SPS/CG configurations, in order to improve overall UE capacity.  |
| ETRI | Proposal 1: To efficiently serve XR traffics having non-integer periodicities, study an extension of SPS configuration to allow different periodicities to different SPS periods (e.g. P1=9ms, P2=8ms, and P3=8ms).Proposal 2: To efficiently handle XR traffic size and arrival timing uncertainty, study dynamic adaptation of SPS resources based on DCI without SPS deactivation/activation.Proposal 3: Study how to improve SPS reliability performance outside the DRX active time (e.g. to configure a supplementary SS set to allow immediate SPS retransmissions outside the active time. ) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 7: When introducing SPS enhancements, a clear benefit of SPS/eSPS for XR use cases should be provided.Proposal 8: When introducing CG enhancements, a clear benefit of CG/eCG for XR use cases should be provided. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 11: Legacy CG to be used for XR UL for pose/control information and no further enhancement required. Proposal 12: The hybrid DG/CG scheme should be used to address the jitter for UL AR.  |
| CEWiT | Proposal 1: Study enhancements to support transmission of traffic with non-integer periodicity using SPS.Proposal 2: Study enhancements to support dynamic adaptation of SPS parameters.Proposal 3: Study enhancements for SPS to handle jitter.Proposal 4: Study solutions to support multi-PDSCH transmission using SPS. |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 1: RAN1 should investigate dynamic adaptation of SPS transmission procedure for efficient resource allocation.Proposal 3: For multi-stream traffic such as the two-stream traffic in UL, mix of CG (for pose/control) and DG (video) based transmission can be considered. Further discussion is needed whether any enhancements with respect to Rel-16 and 17 CG/DG prioritization and handling are needed. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 1: For XR UL/DL video data transmission, use a single activation DCI for the following cases based on the multi-PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling DCI • Case 1: activate a single CG/SPS with multiple PUSCHs/PDSCHs on a CG/SPS occasion• Case 2: activate multiple CGs/SPSs with one PUSCH/PDSCH on an occasion of each CG/SPSProposal 2: Introduce the CG/SPS set switching mechanism to simultaneously activate one set of CGs/SPSs and deactivate another set of CGs/SPSs for adaptative CG/SPS configuration. Timer based switching can be introduced.Proposal 3: Introduce the CG/SPS set skipping mechanism to temporarily deactivate a set of CGs/SPSs and reactivate it after a timer expires.Proposal 4: For single SPS/CG with multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs on a SPS/CG occasion, consider studying methods to skip, modify, or add extra PDSCHs/PUSCHs in an occasion.Proposal 5: For XR, consider studying methods to dynamically adapt the SPS and CG parameters to the traffic bursts.Proposal 6: For XR, consider studying enhancement methods for combined SPS/CG and DG operation:- Implicitly increased PDCCH/SR opportunities before and/or after the SPS/CG occasions- Implicitly increased PDCCH/SR opportunities in cancelled cycles of SPS/CG occasions- SPS/DG piggy-back control information to assist with possible future dynamic grantsProposal 7: For XR, consider studying a design where a short control signal can be sent within a window before the SPS and can be used to cancel, control the occasion start time, or control other SPS parameters.Proposal 8: RAN1 should discuss a solution to address the time mismatch between R16/R17 CG/SPS configuration. The solution can be like those under consideration for a similar issue that exists for CDRX.Proposal 10: For XR, consider studying introducing pre-configured data resources that can be activated or deactivated either explicitly or implicitly. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom co. Ltd | Proposal 3: RAN1 should study mechanisms for adaptively updating the parameters used for an activated SPS/Type-2 CG configuration without reconfiguring or reinitializing the SPS/Type-2 CG configuration.Proposal 4: RAN1 should study mechanisms for adaptively updating the parameters used for Type-1 CG configuration without reconfiguring the CG configuration. |

**Moderator’s summary:**

Many companies shared views regarding the enhancements for SPS/CG.

**Regarding enhancing CG/SPS to accommodate XR packets with large and variable sizes**, views are split in the sense that one group of companies consider CG/SPS based transmissions for these packets and hence propose enhancement. The other group consider that dynamic scheduling should be used in these cases and CG/SPS should be used for small size and predictable XR traffic.

* **Observation 2-1-A:** SPS/CG based transmissions of XR traffic with large and varying packet sizes is motivated and the corresponding enhancements are beneficial.
	+ NEC, Sony, Panasonic, TCL, Apple, CMCC, CEWiT, SPS, QC, FGI, DCM, Lenovo, LG, OPPO
* **Observation 2-1-B**:Dynamic scheduling-based transmissions of XR traffic with large and varying packet sizes is motivated, and hence corresponding enhancements for CG/SPS based transmissions are not needed.
	+ HW/HiSi, Ericsson, vivo, Samsung, Nokia, MTK

Companies with views in line with **Observation 2-1-A** have proposed to study at least the following areas for CG/SPS enhancements:

1. Multiple PUSCHs/PDSCHs in a period using same or different configurations (NEC, Panasonic, DC; Lenovo, LG, QC)
2. Dynamic adaptation of SPS/CG parameters (CMCC, TCL, Sony, ZTE, DCM, ETRI, CEWiT, QC)
3. SPS/CG set switching or skipping mechanisms (QC)
4. SPS HARQ-ACK enhancements (OPPO)
5. CG-UCI enhancements (Apple)
6. Other enhancements

**Regarding the non-integer periodicity**, majority of companies propose enhancements to support non-integer periodicities, while there are companies with the view that no enhancements is needed reusing the existing multiple CG/SPS configuration framework.

* **Observation 2-2-A:** Study support of non-integer periodicity for SPS configurations/Configured grant configurations.
	+ Vivo, Ericsson, Sony, Panasonic, TCL, Apple, CMCC, DCM, Lenovo, LG, CEWiT, ETRI, QC, FGI
* **Observation 2-2-B**: Regarding the non-integer periodicity issue, it can be solved by configuring multiple sets of configured grants
	+ HW/HiSi, [MTK], [Spreadtrum]

Companies with views in line with **Observation 2-2-A** have proposed to study at least the following areas to support non-integer periodicities:

1. Introduce non-integer periodicity (Apple)
2. Multiple periodicities configuration for one SPS configuration can be considered for XR service, which the multiple periodicities are used by turns (CMCC)
3. Dynamic update of periodicity (DCM)
4. Rounding the non-integer transmission instances (Panasonic):
5. Enabling/disabling the non-integer periodicity instances using a virtual cycle (Panasonic)
6. Other approaches

**Moderator’s recommendation for discussion:**

Considering the landscape of views, it is it important to first focus on a high-level discussion to understand the motivations for/against different views at this meeting.

### Discussion 1st round

#### 2.2.1.1 Questionnaire

In the feedback table, companies’ views on SPS/CG enhancements proposals are kindly requested.

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: Which of the **Observations 2-1-A or 2-1-B** is aligned with your view? **Why?** How do you justify the need or lack of need for related enhancement study?
	+ Please indicate and motivate your position. Please include key questions and reasons with consideration to the concerns from the other group.
* **Q2**: Which of the **Observations 2-2-A or 2-2-B** is aligned with your view? **Why?** How do you justify the need or lack of need for related enhancement study?
	+ Please indicate and motivate your position. Please include key questions and reasons with consideration to the concerns from the other group.
* **Q3:** Please share any other comment that helps this discussion.
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.2.1.2 Summary

**Summary of views:** As expected, the majority is in favor of CG/SPS enhancements however the minority are not convinced that the claimed enhancements are needed. Both groups provided motivations to support their preference. There was also suggestion of separating the discussion between UL and DL and focus on CG enhancements.

**Observation 2-1-A:** NEC, QC, CATT, Apple, Intel, ZTE, MOT, LG, Sony, CMCC, CWEiT, IDC, OPPO, HW(UL)

**Observation 2-1-B:** Spreadtrum, MTK, FW, Ericsson, Samsung, vivo (DL), HW(DL)

* + **Open to discuss**: ATT, DCM, CATT?

**Observation 2-2-A:** NEC, QC, ATT, Apple, Intel, DCM, LG, Sony, CMCC, CWEiT, IDC, OPPO, Ericsson (UL), vivo (UL)

**Observation 2-2-B:** MTK, FW, MoT, HW, Samsung(partly)

* **Open to discuss (A/B)**: ZTE, Sony, CATT?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Observation 2-1-A** | **Observation 2-1-B** |
| OK | NEC, QC, CATT, Apple, Intel, ZTE, MOT, LG, Sony, CMCC, CWEiT, IDC, OPPOHW(UL) | Spreadtrum, MTK, FW, Ericsson, Samsungvivo, HW(DL) |
| NOK |   |   |
| Maybe | ATT, DCM | NEC, ATT, DCMCATT? |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Observation 2-2-A** | **Observation 2-2-B** |
| OK | NEC, QC, ATT, Apple, Intel, DCM, LG, Sony, CMCC, CWEiT, IDC, OPPOEricsson,vivo(for UL) | MTK, FW, MOT, HWSamsung(partly) |
| NOK |   |   |
| Maybe | CATT, ZTE | CATT, ZTE, Sony |

**Moderator recommendation:** It is unlikely to be able decide at this stage for one direction. This topic is part of the SID therefore it needs to be investigated. Also, there are many proposals for SPS/CG. Therefore, Moderator suggests for the study, focus on the topics with most support, and provide analysis and comparison to motivate whether the proposed enhancements are justified for the follow-up WI.

**Proposal 2-1:**

To study support of a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic based SPS/CG transmissions, companies are encouraged to consider the following:

* Prioritize the following studies:
	+ - Study support of multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs SPS/CG transmission occasions in a period using same or different configurations
		- Study support of dynamic adaptation of SPS/CG parameters
		- Study support of non-integer periodicity for SPS/CG configurations.
		- Note: Other studies are not precluded.
* Follow the *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique.*

### Discussion 2nd round

#### 2.2.2.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the Proposals 2-1 above?
	+ Please indicate whether in general you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals.
* **Q2**: If you prefer not to prioritize any study area or change the prioritization, how do you envision that all the candidate schemes could be properly analyzed?
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.2.2.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

* Comment to emphasize the benefits should be proved (HW, Samsung).
	+ Moderator thinks it is unnecessary to repeat in every proposal since it is covered in proposals 1-2A-r2 and 1-2B-r2.
* Comment to separate DL and UL (HW).
* Comment to remove “Prioritize…” (vivo, FW).
	+ Considering previous concerns raised, Moderator recommends keep it as it is.
* Comment to remove “same or different configurations” (vivo)
* Comment to add a note to not exclude combination of schemes (ZTE).
	+ Moderator added the bullet. However, it should be understood that the combination of schemes is not precluded.
* Comment to remove sub-bullets, or replace by e.g. (CATT)
	+ Moderator thinks prioritization is needed for managing the studies. All studies are required to prove the gain. Also, it helps if the proposal can be more specific to help of having focused study.
* Comments made regarding not being convinced by enhancements by OK to study due to majority view (MTK), or interested to include other schemes by that is addressed by the note (QC, Sony, ..)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1 | **P2-1** |
| OK | CATT, IDC, Spreadtrum, HW, Samsung, vivo, FGI, DCM, NEC, ZTE, CEWiT, LG, Nokia, Sony, Intel, Motorola, Ericsson, MTK, QC, Sony |
| NOK |   |
| Maybe |   |

**Moderator’s recommendation:**

Based on the comments, Moderator recommends updating the proposal as the following:

**Proposal 2-1-r2:**

To study support of a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic based SPS/CG transmissions, companies are encouraged to consider the following:

* Prioritize the following studies:
	+ - Study support of multiple PDSCHs~~/PUSCHs~~ SPS~~/CG~~ transmission occasions in a period ~~using same or different configurations~~
		- Study support of multiple PUSCHs CG transmission occasions in a period ~~using same or different configurations~~
		- Study support of dynamic adaptation of SPS/CG parameters
		- Study support of non-integer periodicity for SPS/CG transmissions ~~configurations~~.
		- Note: Other studies are not precluded, as well as the combination of the above studies.
* Follow the *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique.*

### Discussion 3rd round

**Proposal 2-1-r3:**

To study support of a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic based SPS/CG transmissions, companies are encouraged to consider the following:

* Prioritize the following studies:
	+ - Study support of multiple PDSCHs SPStransmission occasions in a period
		- Study support of multiple PUSCHs CG transmission occasions in a period
		- Study support of dynamic adaptation of SPS/CG parameters
		- Study support of non-integer periodicity for SPS/CG transmissions.
		- Note: Other studies are not precluded, as well as the combination of the above studies.
* Follow the *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique.*

#### 2.2.3.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the proposals 2-1-r3 above?
	+ Please indicate whether you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals.
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.2.3.2 Summary

TBD

## Dynamic scheduling/grant enhancements

The following table lists the proposals in the contributions submitted in this meeting, discussing views on dynamic scheduling enhancement techniques. For more detailed descriptions and discussions please refer to the corresponding companies’ contributions. Please note that for some enhancements techniques, companies have provided simulations results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 2: The legacy HARQ-ACK mechanism and its enhancement should be investigated when assistance information from higher layer to physical layer is introduced for XR capacity enhancement. |
| vivo | Proposal 3: Study potential enhancements for multi-PXSCH scheduling, e.g. multiple PUCCHs can be indicated by a DL DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1 Dynamic grant should be considered as a baseline for capacity enhancement study.Proposal 4 Study enhancements for multi-slot dynamic scheduling schemes including efficient MCS indication to serve XR traffic in both DL and UL directions. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2: Consider support of CBG-based HARQ-ACK reports for multi-slot PDSCH scheduling.Proposal 3: Consider support of multiple HARQ-ACK occasions for multi-slot PDSCH scheduling.Proposal 5: Apply BPSK/QPSK to SR to indicate 2-4 BSR values in order to reduce latency for UL scheduling. |
| OPPO | Proposal 1: For multi-PDSCH/PUSCH transmission, the exiting mechanisms for NR up to 71GHz spectrum should be reused as much as possible. |
| InterDigital, Inc. | Proposal 3: RAN1 to perform evaluations of XR-specific resource allocation and scheduling enhancement techniques for evaluating the capacity performance |
| TCL Communication Ltd. | Proposal 4: Enhancements of search space set configuration should be considered for XR.Proposal 5: Dynamic scheduling multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH for XR can be considered.Proposal 6: TB processing over multiple slots with no limit of CB and transmission layers can be considered for XR.  |
| Apple | Proposal 3-5: Study whether code block group based transmission can be used to support QoS enhancement at lower layers. |
| CMCC | Proposal 3. Multi-TB scheduling with single DCI on the same cell can be considered to schedule multi-flow transmission of XR service.Proposal 4. Cross-carrier HARQ feedback and cross-carrier retransmission can be considered for XR service. |
| Lenovo | Proposal 2: Study latency reduction for HARQ-ACK transmission for multi-PD(U)SCH scheduling.Proposal 3: Investigate HARQ-NACK prioritization benefits to avoid PDB expiration.Proposal 4: Study if multi-PD(U)SCH scheduling should be further enhanced based on application awareness.Proposal 5: Study techniques providing timely PHR, e.g., UL DCI triggering a PHR.Proposal 6: Study if PHR should be further enhanced based on XR traffic arrival periodicity or UL pose periodicity. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 4: For XR-specific capacity improvement, enhancement on scheduling request can be considered.Proposal 5: At least for jitter handling with dynamic PUSCH scheduling, it is necessary to consider UL grant scheduling overlapped or non-overlapped PUSCH resources.  |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 1: Under CA with different TDD patterns, data retransmission can take place on the carrier different from its initial transmissionProposal 2: Under CA with different TDD patterns, common HARQ processes pool per cell group should be introduced.Proposal 8: Multiple PDSCH scheduling could be used for the scheduling of data for a single UE across multiple slots. Multiple slots could be scheduled using a single Downlink Control information (DCI) carrying the grant of the Physical Downlink Control Channel (PDCCH).Proposal 9: New DCI formats could be defined for the XR traffic or for the PDU sets scheduling. Proposal 10: Two stages DCI could be explored for the XR traffic or for the PDU sets scheduling.  |
| Intel Corporation | Proposal 2: Since a given XR DL or UL packet may require multiple PDSCH or PUSCHs to complete delivery of packet transmission, RAN1 can investigate single DCI based multiple PDSCHs and/or PUSCH scheduling to reduce DCI overhead. • Multiple PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling solution adopted for B52.5GHz can be a starting point. |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 9: For XR, consider studying enhancements for single DCI multi-PDSCH/PUSCH grants including:- Allowing for different configurations per PDSCH/PUSCH in a single DCI grant- Allowing the gNB to change the behavior of one or more of the already granted PDSCHs/PUSCHs after the granting DCI |
| Asia Pacific Telecom co. Ltd | Proposal 1 The mechanism for scheduling multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs via a single DCI developed for Rel-17 NR-U (60 GHz) can be the baseline for NW to schedule data from XR traffic by DGs.Proposal 2 RAN1 should study how to enhance the mechanism for scheduling multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs via a single DCI originally designed for Rel-17 NR-U (60 GHz) for XR. |

**Moderator’s summary:**

Few companies have commonly identified that studying enhancements of the **single DCI scheduling multiple PXSCHs** can be beneficial for XR. Furthermore, few specific enhancement techniques corresponding to this study area (i.e., enhancements of single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs/PUSCHs) are identified by companies. The corresponding main proposals are listed below:

**Proposal 3-1: Study enhancements of legacy procedures for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs/PUSCHs**

* QC, Ericsson, MTK, Lenovo, vivo, TCL, FGI, Intel, CMCC, OPPO

**Proposal 3-1-A:** For single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs/PUSCHs, extending capability of to FR1/FR2 (Intel, FGI)

**Proposal 3-1-B:** For single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs, study HARQ-ACK and CBG enhancements (vivo, Samsung, Lenovo, TCL)

**Proposal 3-1-C:** For single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs, study allowing ddifferent configurations per PDSCH/PUSCH, e.g., for MCS indication (QC, Ericsson)

**Proposal 3-1-D:** For single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs, study update of granted PDSCHs/PUSCHs after the granting DCI (QC)

Companies have also identified other areas for enhancements for **dynamic scheduling** that are not specific to single DCI scheduling multiple PXSCHs, but they are beneficial for XR. The corresponding main proposals are listed below:

**Proposal 3-2-A:** Study enhancement on scheduling request for XR (LG, Samsung)

**Proposal 3-2-B:** Study HARQ-ACK enhancements based on XR specific assistance information for capacity improvement (Spreadtrum, Lenovo)

**Proposal 3-2-C:** Study whether code block group-based transmission can be used to support QoS enhancement at lower layers for XR (Apple)

**Proposal 3-2-D:** Study cross-carrier HARQ feedback and cross-carrier retransmission for XR service (CMCC, MTK)

**Proposal 3-2-E:** Study enhancements of search space set configuration for XR (TCL)

**Proposal 3-2-F:** Study techniques providing timely PHR for XR services (Lenovo)

**Proposal 3-2-G:** Study two stages DCI for the PDU sets scheduling of XR traffic (MTK)

**Proposal 3-2-H:** At least for jitter handling with dynamic PUSCH scheduling, it is necessary to consider UL grant scheduling overlapped or non-overlapped PUSCH resources (LG)

### Discussion 1st round

#### 2.3.1.1 Questionnaire

In the feedback table, companies’ views on dynamic scheduling enhancements proposals are kindly requested.

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1-1**: What is your view regarding the study topic in Proposal 3-1 during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not. Please motivate your reasons.
* **Q1-2**: What is your view regarding the specific study areas by Proposal 3-1-A to Proposal 3-1-D during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not of any of these studies.
* **Q2**: What is your view regarding the specific study areas by Proposal 3-2-A to Proposal 3-2-H during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not of any of these studies.
* **Q3:** Please share any other comment that helps this discussion.
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Summary

**Summary of views**:

**Proposal 3-1:**

**OK:** Spreadtrum, MTK, QC, Intel, DCM, ZTE, MOT, Nokia, LG, Sony, CMCC, Ericsson, IDC

**Not OK:** CATT, Apple, FW, HW, vivo

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **P3-1-A** | **P3-1-B** | **P3-1-C** | **P3-1-D** |
| OK | Spreadtrum, Intel, DCM, LG, Ericsson, IDC | Spreadtrum, Intel, DCM, LG, Ericsson, OPPO | Spreadtrum, Intel, DCM, LG, Ericsson, IDC | Spreadtrum, Sony, Ericsson |
| NOK | CATT | CATT | CATT, Samsung | CATT, Intel, DCM, LG, Samsung |
|  | **P3-2-A** | **P3-2-B** | **P3-2-C** | **P3-2-D** |
| OK | LG, Ericsson, Samsung | Spreadtrum, DCM, Ericsson | Ericsson, Samsung | DCM |
| NOK | CATT, Intel | CATT, Intel, LG, Samsung | CATT, Intel | CATT, Intel, Samsung |
|  | **P3-2-E** | **P3-2-F** | **P3-2-G** | **P3-2-H** |
| OK |   |   |   | LG |
| NOK | Spreadtrum, CATT, Intel, Samsung | CATT, Intel, Samsung | Spreadtrum, CATT, Intel, Samsung | CATT, Intel, Samsung |

**Moderator’s recommendation:** The situation is similar to SPS/CG. Therefore, Moderator’s recommendation is to focus on few areas (e.g., P3-1A, P3-1B, P3-1C, P3-2-A) and follow the common principle to motivate the need for the enhancement.

Proposal 3-1:

To study support of a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic based dynamic scheduling/grant transmissions, companies are encouraged to consider the following:

* Prioritize the following studies:
	+ - Study extending capability of single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs/PUSCHs for FR2-2 to FR1/FR2.
		- Study HARQ-ACK and CBG enhancements for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs.
		- Study allowing different configurations per PDSCH/PUSCH, e.g., for MCS indication for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs.
		- Study enhancement on scheduling request
		- Note: Other studies are not precluded.
* Follow the *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique.*

### Discussion 2nd round

#### 2.3.2.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the Proposals 3-1 above?
	+ Please indicate whether in general you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals.
* **Q2**: If you prefer not to prioritize any study area or change the prioritization, how do you envision that all the candidate schemes could be properly analysed?
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.3.2.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

* Comment to emphasize the benefits should be proved (HW, LG).
	+ Moderator thinks it is unnecessary to repeat in every proposal since it is covered in proposals 1-2A-r2 and 1-2B-r2.
* Comment to add BSR enhancements (HW).
* Comment to remove “Prioritize…” (vivo, FW).
	+ Considering previous concerns raised, Moderator recommends keep it as it is.
* Comment to add “Study for delay reduction... for SR” (vivo)
	+ The moderator thinks no need to go to this level of details to mention the reasons. The enhancements should show some gain in capacity regardless.
* Comment to add a note for postponing until having sufficient conclusions in B52 (ZTE)
	+ Moderator thinks that level of detail is not needed at this stage. The areas are very broad and can cover the parts that are stable.
* Comment to remove two sub-bullets (LG)
	+ Having focus helps the study. Moderator suggests keeping them.
* Comments made regarding not being convinced by enhancements by OK to study due to majority view (MTK), or interested to include other schemes by that is addressed by the note (QC)
* Comments to include enhancements e.g., XR-PMW and UE playout buffer schemes in R1-2203485 (CATT)
* Moderator thinks XR-PMW (power saving enhancements in R1-2203485 should be considers in power saving AI, and UE playout buffer scheme is related to enhancements in Section 2.4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1 | **P3-1** |
| OK | MT, QC, IDC, HW, vivo, Samsung, FGI, DCM, NEC, ZTE, LG, Nokia, FW, Intel, Motorola, Spreadtrum, Ericsson |
| NOK |   |
| Maybe | CATT? |

**Moderator’s recommendation:**

Based on the comments, Moderator recommends updating the proposal as the following:

**Proposal 3-1-r2:**

To study support of a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic based dynamic scheduling/grant transmissions, companies are encouraged to consider the following:

* Prioritize the following studies:
	+ - Study extending capability of single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs/PUSCHs for FR2-2 to FR1/FR2.
		- Study HARQ-ACK and CBG enhancements for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs.
		- Study allowing different configurations per PDSCH/PUSCH, e.g., for MCS indication for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs.
		- Study enhancement on scheduling request and/or BSR.
		- Note: Other studies are not precluded as well as the combination of the above studies.
* Follow the *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique.*

### Discussion 3rd round

**Proposal 3-1-r3:**

To study support of a candidate capacity enhancement technique for XR traffic based dynamic scheduling/grant transmissions, companies are encouraged to consider the following:

* Prioritize the following studies:
	+ - Study extending capability of single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs/PUSCHs for FR2-2 to FR1/FR2.
		- Study HARQ-ACK and CBG enhancements for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs.
		- Study allowing different configurations per PDSCH/PUSCH, e.g., for MCS indication for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCHs.
		- Study enhancement on scheduling request and/or BSR.
		- Note: Other studies are not precluded as well as the combination of the above studies.
* Follow the *common principle for assessment of the candidate capacity enhancement technique.*

#### 2.3.3.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the proposals 3-1-r3 above?
	+ Please indicate whether you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals.
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.3.3.2 Summary

TBD

## Scheduling awareness related enhancements

The following table lists the proposals in the contributions submitted in this meeting, discussing views on BSR enhancements and XR application awareness that facilitates e.g., delay-aware scheduling and packet dropping mechanisms. For more detailed descriptions and discussions please refer to the corresponding companies’ contributions. Please note that for some enhancements techniques, companies have provided simulations results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 1: Assistance information from higher layer to physical layer should be considered for XR capacity enhancement. |
| CATT | Proposal 2: The gNB scheduling awareness schemes should be considered to improve the capacity performance of XR-specific traffic. |
| vivo | Proposal 2: Study mechanisms for the UE to adjust the conveyed content and/or attribute(s) of a dynamically granted UL transmission before performing the UL transmission, e.g. re-purposing a re-transmission grant for a new transmission or vice versa. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 3: Buffer size reporting enhancement techniques, including e.g., enhanced BSR indication, can be considered for improving capacity for XR service. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 5 Study enhancements of BSR consisting of improving BSR granularity and including delay information in the BSR relevant to XR traffic.Proposal 6 Study mechanisms for dropping late application packets as possible solutions to increase XR capacity. |
| NEC | Proposal 6: Specify a higher layer parameter of ‘frame per second’ for the frame rate of XR traffic.Proposal 7: Study mechanism of packet dropping based on the PDB requirement, in order to avoid resource waste due to the out-of-date packets. |
| InterDigital, Inc. | Proposal 1: Capture in TR, XR-specific enhancements for capacity that support adaptations based on PDU set characteristics in UL and DLProposal 2: Capture in TR, XR-specific enhancements for capacity that support transmission of multiple associated/correlated traffic streams in UL and DLProposal 5: Starting point for potential enhancement techniques for capacity can be those identified during Rel-17 SI (e.g. delay aware scheduling, prioritizing/pre-empting important streams in DL/UL, multi-TB scheduling, enhanced BSR) |
| Lenovo | Proposal 1: Study the benefits of indicating the remaining delay budget for a packet and/or a PDU set:• gNB indicating such delay budget to UE for DL/UL packet and/or PDU set• UE indicating such delay budget to gNB for UL/DL packet and/or PDU setProposal 10: Investigate leveraging XR application awareness (e.g., video slice and stream awareness, video slice importance) to map video slices to TB CBGs for optimized transmissions and retransmissions of XR traffic. |

**Moderator’s summary:**

Most of the enhancements related to the proposals are not physical later related, however the proposals are motivated to emphasize the importance of availability of XR-specific information that can be used to improve the XR capacity performance. Therefore:

* **Moderator’s observation:** The proposals suggest that RAN1 can study the benefit of availability of the XR-specific information for resource allocation and corresponding procedures by investigating the XR capacity performance improvements, although how the information is provided is not within the RAN1 scope. The proposals seem to address What information is useful, and How it can be used used to improve XR capacity.

The proposals above are summarized in the following:

**Proposal 4-1:** Study the benefits of XR application awareness scheduling to improve XR capacity

* Spreadtrum, CATT, Ericsson, IDC, Lenovo

**Proposal 4-2:** Study BSR enhancement to improve XR capacity

* vivo, ZTE, Ericsson, IDC

**Proposal 4-3:** Study the benefits of indicating the remaining delay budget for a packet and/or a PDU set

* Lenovo, Ericsson

**Proposal 4-4:** Study mechanism of packet dropping based on the PDB requirement

* Ericsson, NEC

**Proposal 4-5:** Study mechanisms for the UE to adjust the conveyed content and/or attribute(s) of a dynamically granted UL transmission before performing the UL transmission, e.g., re-purposing a re-transmission grant for a new transmission or vice versa

* vivo

### Discussion 1st round

#### 2.4.1.1 Questionnaire

In the feedback table, companies’ views on the scheduling awareness related enhancements proposals are kindly requested.

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view regarding study the scheduling awareness related enhancements in RAN1? Do you share similar observation as Moderator?
* **Q2**: What is your view regarding Proposals 4-1 to 4-5 and related studies during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not of any of these studies.
* **Q3:** Please share any other comment that helps this discussion.
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.4.1.2 Summary

**Summary of views**:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Q1: OK with topic? |
| OK | Spreadtrum, NEC, MTK, QC, ATT, CATT, Apple, DCM, ZTE, MOT, Sony, Ericsson, IDC, Samsung, vivoIntel(Optional)Nokia(RAN2 should start)CMCC(need initial guidance from RAN2) |
| NOK | Nokia(RAN2 to initiate)LG (Minimum scope)OPPO (not in scope) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q2: | **P4-1** | **P4-2** | **P4-3** | **P4-4** | **P4-5** |
| OK | Spreadtrum, NEC, MTK, QC, ATT, CATT, vivo, DCM, MOT, Sony, CMCC, Ericsson, IDC, SamsungIntel(Optional) | NEC, MTK, QC, ATT, CATT, FW, vivo, DCM, ZTE, MOT, LG, Sony, CMCC, Ericsson, IDCHW(add SR) | NEC, MTK, QC, ATT, CATT, FW, vivo, DCM, MOT, Sony, CMCC, HW, Ericsson, IDC, SamsungIntel(Optional) | spreadtrum, NEC, MTK, ATT, CATT, FW, vivo, DCM, MOT, CMCC, Ericsson, IDC, Samsung | CATT, vivo, DCM, LG, CMCC |
| NOK | HW | Intel |   | QC, Intel, HW | Spreadtrum, QC, Intel, HW, Ericsson, IDC, Samsung, MOT(alt solution) |
| Maybe |   |   | Spreadtrum |   | MTK |

**Moderator’s comment and recommendation:**

There is strong support for this study. P4-1 to P4-4 have strongest support. Moderator recommends deprioritizing P4-5. Regardless, concerns expressed that the work should be initiated by RAN2 and upon RAN2 request, RAN1 to perform related studies. This is an important aspect and moderator recommends that in the next round to discuss more how to address the logistic.

### Discussion 2nd round

#### 2.4.2.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on Moderator’s recommendation from outcome of 1st rounds? Does RAN1 should wait for RAN2 to perform scheduling awareness evaluations? Or can RAN1 based on agreed simulation assumptions perform the study and compare the schemes?
* **Q2**: If you prefer not to prioritize any study area or change the prioritization, how do you envision that all the candidate schemes could be properly analysed?
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.4.2.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Q1: | OK to down-prioritize P4-5?  | RAN1 work triggered by RAN2 request? |
| OK | MTK, IDC, HW, FGI, DCM, NEC, Sony, Intel, Motorola, Spreadtrum, Ericsson | MTK, HW, Samsung, DCM, Nokia, Sony, Intel, Motorola, Spreadtrum, Ericsson |
| NOK | vivo | CATT, IDC, vivo, FGI, NEC, ZTE, LG |
| Maybe |   |   |

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Although the views are diverged, however as companies correctly pointed out SID clearly tasks RAN2 for this topic. It is also well understood that RAN2 would eventually needs RAN1 help in assessment of benefits. Given this aspect and considering the already large scopes of RAN1-related studies areas, Moderator recommends performing these studies in RAN1 once requested by RAN2.

Based on the comments, Moderator recommends the following conclusion:

**Proposed conclusion 4-1-r2:**

It is common understanding that studying the benefits of XR application awareness scheduling to improve XR capacity in RAN1 can be prioritized when requested by RAN2.

**The above proposal was discussed during GTW and was updated as the following, but not endorsed yet.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**It is common understanding that studying of RAN2 proposed techniques for XR-specific scheduling information to improve XR capacity can be studied in RAN1 upon request from RAN2. |

### Discussion 3rd round

**Proposed conclusion 4-1-r3:**

It is common understanding that studying of RAN2 proposed techniques for XR-specific scheduling information to improve XR capacity can be studied in RAN1 upon request from RAN2.

#### 2.4.3.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the proposed conclusion 4-1-r3 above?
	+ Please indicate whether you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals.
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.4.3.2 Summary

TBD

## Link adaptation and MIMO enhancements

The following proposals to enhance the link adaptation to improve XR capacity are presented for discussions at this meeting. For more detailed descriptions and discussions please refer to the corresponding companies’ contributions. Please note that for some enhancements techniques, companies have provided simulations results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 1: Study enhancements to MU-MIMO with a large number of antennas in order to increase the system capacity of XRProposal 2: Support cooperative MIMO via DL interference probing based on SRS enhancements to improve XR system capacity for TDD. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 4: Link adaptation enhancement for re-transmission techniques, including e.g. delta MCS, can be studied for XR service transmission to improve capacity performance. |
| Samsung | Proposal 4: Consider CSI report enhancements to address the different BLER requirements of different XR flows.Proposal 7: For operation in FR2, allow a UE to perform beam management and CSI reporting during the DRX Off cycle. |
| Apple | Proposal 3-1: Study soft HARQ-ACK feedback according to PDSCH reception to support low latency traffic efficiently. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 9: Further study enhanced CQI schemes that guides the gNB on the maximum MCS scheme, subject to controlling CBG errors is proposed. Such a mechanism may e.g. ensure that only a certain maximum subset of CBGs will need retransmission with a controllable probability.  |

**Moderator’s summary:**

The proposals above can be categorised as below.

* **Proposed study areas for link adaptation enhancements to improve XR capacity**
	1. **Delta MCS (ZTE)**
	2. **Soft HARQ-ACK feedback (Apple)**
	3. **Cooperative MIMO scheme via precoding technique - bi-directional training(FW)**
	4. **Enhanced link adaptation for CBG-based transmission (Nokia)**
	5. **CSI report enhancements to address the different BLER requirements of different XR flows (Samsung)**
	6. **Beam management and CSI reporting during the DRX Off cycle for FR2 (Samsung)**

### Discussion 1st round

#### 2.5.1.1 Questionnaire

In the feedback table, companies’ views on the link adaptation enhancements proposals are kindly requested.

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view regarding study link adaptation enhancements during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not.
* **Q2**: What is your view regarding the specific proposed study areas 1 to 6 for link adaptation enhancements during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not of any of these studies.
* **Q3:** Please share any other comment that helps this discussion.
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### Summary

**Summary of views:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  Q1: OK with topic? |
| OK | Nokia, Sony, FW |
| NOK | QC, Intel(non-XR), LG, OPPO, HW, vivo, Ericsson(low prio if needed) |
| Maybe | Spreadtrum(but not repeating old),MTK, MOT(low prio, not XR specific) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q2: | **a** | **b** | **c** | **d** | **e** | **f** |
| OK | FW, ZTE, Sony | FW, Sony | FW | Nokia | Sony, Samsung | FW, Samsung |
| NOK |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Maybe |   |   |   |   |   | MTK |

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Down prioritize this topic.

### Discussion 2nd round

#### 2.5.2.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on Moderator’s recommendation from outcome of 1st rounds?
* **Q2**: If you prefer not to prioritize any study area or change the prioritization, how do you envision that all the candidate schemes could be properly analysed?
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### Summary

**Summary of views:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1: | OK to down-prioritize? |
| OK | MTK (except E), CATT, HW, IDC, vivo, LG, Intel, Motorola, Spreadtrum, Ericsson |
| NOK | Nokia(specially D), ZTE, FW (specially C?) |
| Maybe |  |

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Based on the inputs, there is no consensus to down prioritize the topic. However, it seems with consideration to favourite schemes of proponents, the study areas (b), (f) can be down prioritized. Further discussions are needed to reach on a consensus on other areas.

Based on the comments, Moderator recommends updating the proposal as the following:

**Proposal 5-1-r2:**

* **Further discuss whether to consider the following areas for link adaptation enhancements to improve XR capacity**
	1. **Delta MCS**
	2. **~~Soft HARQ-ACK feedback~~**
	3. **Cooperative MIMO scheme via precoding technique - bi-directional training**
	4. **Enhanced link adaptation for CBG-based transmission**
	5. **CSI report enhancements to address the different BLER requirements of different XR flows**
	6. **~~Beam management and CSI reporting during the DRX Off cycle for FR2~~**
* **Note: Continue discussion at least during this meeting (RAN1#109-e) for potential deprioritization of the list above or down-selection of candidate study areas from the list above**.

### 2.5.3 Discussion 3rd round

After Moderator’s recommendation above, it was requested by Apple to keep scheme b.

After GTW, MTK requested to consider their proposal in section 2.8, like be listed as one candidate for further study like link adaptation considering similar support rate. Therefore, it is added below as candidate (g).

**Note that this proposal, with respect to prioritization suggested by Moderaotr after 2nd round, has not been discussed yet.**

**Proposal 5-1-r3:**

* **Further discuss whether to consider the following areas for link adaptation enhancements to improve XR capacity**
	1. **Delta MCS**
	2. **Soft HARQ-ACK feedback**
	3. **Cooperative MIMO scheme via precoding technique - bi-directional training**
	4. **Enhanced link adaptation for CBG-based transmission**
	5. **CSI report enhancements to address the different BLER requirements of different XR flows**
	6. **~~Beam management and CSI reporting during the DRX Off cycle for FR2~~**
	7. **Dynamic L1 based MG activation/deactivation. Reuse current R16/R17 RRM relaxation condition to allow scheduling in MG to transform the R16/R17 RRM power saving gain into capacity gain.**
* **Note: Continue discussion at least during this meeting (RAN1#109-e) for potential deprioritization of the list above or down-selection of candidate study areas from the list above**.

#### 2.5.3.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the proposal 5-1-r3 above?
	+ Please indicate whether you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals.
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.5.3.2 Summary

TBD

## Intra/Inter-UE multiplexing and prioritization enhancements

Few companies consider enhancements of inter-UE/intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization techniques are beneficial for XR capacity improvements and proposed the following proposals. For more detailed descriptions and discussions please refer to the corresponding companies’ contributions. Please note that for some enhancements techniques, companies have provided simulations results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 5: Adaptive inter-UE/intra-UE multiplexing techniques, including e.g. finer granularity preemption indication, should be studied for transmission to improve system capacity performance. |
| InterDigital, Inc. | Proposal 5: Starting point for potential enhancement techniques for capacity can be those identified during Rel-17 SI (e.g. delay aware scheduling, prioritizing/pre-empting important streams in DL/UL, multi-TB scheduling, enhanced BSR) |
| III | Proposal#1: In order to properly accommodate the XR service, we propose to increase the priority index to be more than one bit.Proposal#2: We propose both the time and frequency domains shall be considered to reduce delay impacts, when the XR frame is preempted.Proposal#3: Because the XR service is delay sensitive, we propose the case of XR service preempting URLLC shall be considered. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal 6: For XR-specific capacity improvement, it can be considered to study XR-specific priority handling.  |

**Moderator’s summary:**

The proposals above can be categorised as below.

* **Proposed study areas for inter-UE/intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization enhancements to improve XR capacity**
	1. **Finer granularity pre-emption indication (ZTE)**
	2. **Pre-emption in both time and frequency domains (III)**
	3. **XR-specific priority handling (LG, III)**

### Discussion 1st round

#### 2.6.1.1 Questionnaire

In the feedback table, companies’ views on the inter-UE/intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization enhancement techniques are kindly requested.

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view regarding study inter-UE/intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization enhancement techniques during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not.
* **Q2:** What is your view regarding the specific proposed study areas 1 to 3 for inter-UE/intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization enhancements during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not of any of these studies.
* **Q3:** Please share any other comment that helps this discussion.
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.6.1.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1: | OK with topic? |
| OK | ZTE, LG, Sony, III |
| NOK | CATT, Intel, FW, MOT, Nokia, HW, Ericsson, Samsung, vivo |
| Maybe | MTK |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q2: | **a** | **b** | **c** |
| OK | ZTE, Sony, III | ZTE, Sony, III | ZTE, LG, III |
| NOK | MTK, Intel, vivo | MTK, Intel | Intel |
| Maybe |   |   | MTK |

**Moderator’s recommendation**: Down prioritize this topic.

### Discussion 2nd round

#### 2.6.2.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What I your view on Moderator’s recommendation from outcome of 1st rounds?
* **Q2**: If you prefer not to prioritize any study area or change the prioritization, how do you envision that all the candidate schemes could be properly analysed?
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.6.2.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1: | OK to down-priorotize? |
| OK | MTK, CATT, HW, IDC, vivo, Nokia, FW, Intel, Motorola, Spreadtrum, Ericsson |
| NOK | ZTE, LG(3rd bullet), III |
| Maybe | FGI (Ok to compromise) |

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Based on the inputs, there is no consensus to down priorotize the topic or a study area. **Further discussions are needed to reach on a consensus on study areas.**

### Discussion 3rd round

During GTW, ZTE showed concern on down-scoping, indicating the provided performance capacity gain. Moderator updates the proposal as the following and seeks companies’ views. For more details, please review ZTE contirbuton.

**Proposal 6-1-r3:**

**Study adaptive inter-UE/intra-UE multiplexing techniques, including e.g. finer granularity preemption indication to improve XR capacity performance**

#### 2.6.3.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view on discussion above and the proposal 6-1-r3 above?

Please indicate whether you are supportive, and whether you have suggestions to improve the description of the proposals. |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.6.3.2 Summary

TBD

## Network coding

Two companies consider network coding schemes are beneficial for XR capacity improvements and proposed the following proposals. For more detailed descriptions and discussions please refer to the corresponding companies’ contributions. Please note that the companies have provided simulations results to motivate the proposed enhancements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 6: Network coding techniques should be considered for XR service transmission to improve capacity performance. |
| Lenovo | Proposal 8: Study the application of NC for XR traffic and its influence on L1/L2 stack.Proposal 9: Study efficient and backwards-compatible feedback procedures for NC and investigate role of existent HARQ feedback loop. |

### Discussion 1st round

#### 2.7.1.1 Questionnaire

In the feedback table, companies’ views on the Network coding proposals are kindly requested.

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view regarding study Network coding during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not of any of these studies.
* **Q2:** Please share any other comment that helps this discussion.
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.7.1.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1: | OK with topic? |
| OK | ZTE, MOT |
| NOK | MTK, QC, CATT,Intel, FW, vivo, Nokia, Sony, HW, Ericsson, IISc, OPPO, Samsung |
| Maybe | LG |

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Down prioritize this topic.

### Discussion 2nd round

#### 2.7.2.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What I your view on Moderator’s recommendation from outcome of 1st rounds?
* **Q2**: If you prefer not to prioritize any study area or change the prioritization, how do you envision that all the candidate schemes could be properly analysed?
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.7.2.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1: | OK to down-prioritize? |
| OK | MTK, CATT, HW, IDC, vivo, LG; Nokia, FW, Sony, Intel, Motorola, Spreadtrum, Ericsson |
| NOK | ZTE |
| Maybe |   |

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Considering all companies, except one, supports Moderator’s recommendation, and the topic is understood to be more general than XR, Moderator recommends to down prioritize this study area**.**

**Proposed conclusion 7-1-r2:** Study of Network coding for capacity enhancements during Rel-18 XR SI is down prioritized.

**The following was endorsed during the GTW:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**Study of network coding for capacity enhancements during Rel-18 XR SI is down prioritized in RAN1. |

## Measurement gaps-based enhancements

One company proposes to study enhancements based on measurement-gap framework to improve consequently the XR capacity performance. For more detailed descriptions and discussions please refer to the corresponding company contribution. Please note that the company has provided simulations results to motivate the proposed enhancements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 3: For capacity enhancement of XR application, RAN1 to exploit possible solutions to smartly prioritize XR decoding in measurement gap and skip the inter-frequency measurement (in measurement gap) with orchestrated gNB/UE coordination.Proposal 4: Support dynamic L1 based MG activation/deactivation. The structure of a MG is similar to a DRX cycle, both including a duration and a period. This dynamic L1 based MG activation/deactivation is to the MG like R16 WUS is to the DRX.Proposal 5: Reuse current R16/R17 RRM relaxation condition (or create new conditions more suitable for XR) to allow scheduling in MG to transform the R16/R17 RRM power saving gain into capacity gain. For example, the following conditions can be considered: lowMobilityEvaluation (38.304) for stationary UE ~cellEdgeEvaluation (38.304) for not-at-cell-edge UEProposal 6: Define new MG patterns for joint optimization with the XR eDRX cycles ( e.g. 16.6 ms). Otherwise, the measurement gap may overlap with the DRX on duration and deteriorate XR capacity. |

### Discussion 1st round

#### 2.8.1.1 Questionnaire

In the feedback table, companies’ views on the proposals above regarding enhancements based on measurement-gap framework are kindly requested.

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What is your view regarding study the proposed enhancement based on measurement gaps related procedures during XR SI?
	+ Please indicate and motivate whether you are supportive or not of any of these studies.
* **Q2:** Please share any other comment that helps this discussion.
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.8.1.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1: | OK with topic? |
| OK | MTK, QC, Samsung |
| NOK | CATT, Intel, vivo, LG, Nokia, Sony, Ericsson |
| Maybe | FW, ZTE, MoT(low prio), HW |

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Down prioritize this topic.

### Discussion 2nd round

#### 2.8.2.1 Questionnaire

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions:** * **Q1**: What I your view on Moderator’s recommendation from outcome of 1st rounds?
* **Q2**: If you prefer not to prioritize any study area or change the prioritization, how do you envision that all the candidate schemes could be properly analysed?
* **Companies are kindly requested to provide any update/correction on the discussion and/or their respective positions.**
 |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

#### 2.8.2.2 Summary

**Summary of views:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q1: | OK to down-prioritize? |
| OK | CATT, vivo, LG, Nokia, Sony, Intel, Motorola, Spreadtrum |
| NOK | MTK, QC, HW, ZTE, FW |
| Maybe | Ericsson |

**Explanations on usefulness of the study for XR-specific by proponents (QC, MTK):** From UE perspective, MG is a basic feature required for UE to operate in multi-frequency networks. Since XR frame periodicity (Hz, fps) cannot be aligned with MG periodicity (20/40/80/160ms), MG period will be eventually overlapped with XR traffic transmission period regardless of what offset value is initially set to UE, and frequently interrupt the XR traffic. This basically means that XR application cannot run with MG, although it is a very fundamental feature for UE. Thus, we believe that the enhancement for MG should be considered in R18 XR study.

**Moderator’s recommendation:** Discuss more during this meeting to understand better if the enhancements is specifically useful for XR. If that is the case, Moderator recommends considering this study**.**

**After GTW, based on MediaTek request, this proposal is considered together with other candidate enhancements in section 2.5.**

## Other

Please use the feedback table below to provide any general or specific comments related to the XR capacity enhancement study in RAN1. Particularly, comments that help to focus the discussion during the SI are very appreciated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion

TBD
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